IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * CRIMINAL ACTION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA * 14-121ML

VS. * OCTOBER 20, 2015

KEMONT BOWIE * PROVIDENCE, RI

HEARD BEFORE THE HONORABLE MARY M. LISI SENIOR JUDGE

(Sentencing)

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE GOVERNMENT: ADI GOLDSTEIN, AUSA

U.S. Attorney's Office

50 Kennedy Pĺaza

Providence, RI 02903

FOR THE DEFENDANT: OLIN THOMPSON, ESQ.

Federal Defender's Office

10 Weybosset Street

Suite 300

Providence, RI 02903

Court Reporter: Anne M. Clayton, RPR

One Exchange Terrace Providence, RI 02903

Proceeding reported and produced by computer-aided stenography

20 OCTOBER 2015 -- 9:50 A.M.

THE COURT: This is the matter of the United

States versus Kemont Bowie. The matter is before the

Court this morning for imposition of sentence.

Before we begin, I'd like to see counsel briefly at the bench, please.

(Bench conference off the record.)

THE COURT: The Court is in receipt of the presentence report prepared by the Probation Office. The probation officer has conducted a guidelines analysis for Mr. Bowie and has determined that he has a criminal history category of 6 with a total offense level of 29, which provides for a guideline range of 151 to 188 months of incarceration as to Counts II and III. As to Count V, it's a restricted range of 60 months.

In addition to the presentence report, I have the Defendant's motion for sentencing consideration.

I did not see any objections filed to the presentence report, Mr. Thompson, so I take it that you are in agreement with the guideline calculation.

MR. THOMPSON: Your Honor, yes and no. The original presentence report, which I believe was filed on August 13th --

THE COURT: I'm looking at one from September

9th.

MR. THOMPSON: For some reason, your Honor, there was an issue and it may still be, I believe it is, because the Government had the same issue, that that did not appear on ECF. And for that reason neither I or the Government actually looked at the second copy until the last several days.

THE COURT: Document number 58 filed September 9th.

MR. THOMPSON: Right. It doesn't appear on the docket that either of us can see, your Honor; and for that reason, neither of us actually -- this doesn't affect the guideline range.

THE COURT: I think if I'm understanding you correctly that what may have happened was that when it was filed by Probation, they may have hit the wrong button.

MR. THOMPSON: I think that's possible. For that reason -- and what I'm referring to in the copy that you have in front of you, the September 9th, and I always note this because you said at the end there Count V carries a five-year maximum. Under this case, Count V is going to be dismissed. I think that portion of the -- and that did not appear in the first presentence report that we had from August 13th. As

part of the plea agreement, the Government is dismissing that.

MS. GOLDSTEIN: Your Honor, if I may --

THE COURT: I don't have that in the plea agreement. Count I, II -- he's pleading -- just a second. Maybe you're right. Counts IV and V are being dismissed.

MR. THOMPSON: Correct, your Honor.

And the outcome of that, your Honor, is that in the presentence report you have from September 9th, paragraphs 33 through 42 address a second grouping of counts, but that actually -- that grouping only pertains to Count V so that should -- that doesn't change the final guideline but --

THE COURT: It's irrelevant.

MR. THOMPSON: -- it's irrelevant. The Government and I are in agreement that everything else in the PSR is correct and the one from August 13th was correct.

THE COURT: When you couldn't look at it, did you call Probation?

MR. THOMPSON: I'm not sure how actually I got it, your Honor. It's not on the docket, but I have it.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to ask Probation to amend the presentence report to accurately reflect

```
what's contained in the plea agreement, which is that
 1
 2
      the Government today will be moving to dismiss Counts
 3
      IV and V and, therefore, paragraphs 34 through I think
      it's 39 --
 4
 5
              MR. THOMPSON: It would be 33 through 42, your
 6
      Honor.
 7
              THE COURT:
                          33 through --
 8
              MR. THOMPSON:
                             42. That would leave the offense
9
      level on paragraph 32 is at 32 and then we get the --
10
              THE COURT:
                          Right.
11
              MR. THOMPSON:
                             Down to 29.
12
              THE COURT: So would you prepare an amended PSR
13
      that eliminates paragraphs 33 through 42 because
14
      they're not relevant.
15
              And as you say, the total offense level and
16
      criminal history score remain the same.
17
              MR. THOMPSON: That's correct.
18
              THE COURT: And the guideline range then is 151
19
      to 188.
20
              MR. THOMPSON: We agree, Judge.
21
              MS. GOLDSTEIN: That's correct, your Honor.
22
              THE COURT:
                         However, I think I said with respect
23
      to Count I, the range is restricted at 60 --
24
              MR. THOMPSON:
                             Yes, your Honor.
25
              THE COURT: -- which is correct.
```

Other than that objection, Mr. Thompson, do you have any others to the presentence report?

MR. THOMPSON: No, thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. I'll hear from the Government, then, on sentence.

MS. GOLDSTEIN: Your Honor, Defendant pleaded guilty to conspiracy to traffic a minor female and an adult female in violation of 18 United States Code Section 371. He pleaded guilty to sex trafficking of a minor in violation of 18 United States Code Section 1591(a)(1) and (b)(1)(2), and he pleaded guilty to transportation of a minor for sexual activity in violation of 18 United States Code Section 2423(a) and (2).

As the Court is aware, the Defendant is facing a mandatory minimum term of incarceration of ten years on Counts II and III; and as the Court has just noted, his guidelines range is 151 to 188 months.

On August 7th, 2015, this Court sentenced Co-Defendant Ricky Wallace to 144 months for the same offense. That sentence was within that Co-Defendant's guidelines range.

Wallace's offense level was the same as

Defendant Bowie's, however, his criminal history

category was a one level lower.

Today the Government asks the Court to impose a sentence of 156 months on Mr. Bowie. That is 13 years, a sentence that is within the guideline range. That sentence is reasonable and called for in this case in light of the nature and circumstances of the offense and the history and characteristics of this Defendant.

The facts of the case are appalling. Defendant and Co-Defendant, Ricky Wallace, conspired to lure young women, vulnerable, run-aways, homeless from South Station in Boston to Providence, Rhode Island for purposes of prostitution.

The Defendant had already been prostituting Raechyl Spooner for months. He beat her. He took over her apartment where she was residing with her young daughter, and he made her into a co-conspirator in this enterprise by getting her to drive these two women from Boston to Rhode Island and then teach the young victim, a 17-year-old girl, the ropes by taking her on walks to pick up johns, by taking her photograph and posting her on Backpage, by having her watch how it was done and then by doing it herself.

The Defendant, as was his Co-Defendant, Ricky Wallace, they're predators. Simple as that. Instead of going out to work -- this is a 35-year-old man, six feet tall, 250 pounds. He could roll up sleeves, sweat

himself and make a living. But why do that when you can just force young women to sell their bodies while you sit in another room and wait for them to hand over the money.

They get women to sell their bodies and they reap the rewards.

In this case, the first victim, a 17-year-old girl, ran away from a group home in Boston and found herself literally imprisoned for a week, forced to work as a prostitute, selling her body at times for as little as pizza and \$20.

The second woman, a 22-year-old, reported that she was sexually assaulted by the Co-Defendant, Ricky Wallace, after she refused to work as a prostitute. Both of these young women reached out to law enforcement begging to be rescued.

The 17-year-old victim reported that this

Defendant, who she was told to refer to as "Daddy,"

trained her along with Spooner to become a prostitute.

And when Spooner refused to work, she watched this

Defendant strike her. She also observed Wallace strike
the 22-year-old victim in her presence.

This is violent stuff, and it is consistent with this Defendant's history.

Now, the Defendant has argued that his criminal

history might be over-representative of his past. Your Honor, the Government submits that it is not. It does not paint a pretty picture. The Court is entitled to consider all of the Defendant's background and characteristics.

In addition to the several convictions that are outlined in the PSR for drug trafficking offenses for which he garnered the most points as well as the fact that he committed this offense while on a criminal justice sentence in the State, his criminal history is significant for multiple convictions and arrests, admittedly dismissed cases, for domestic violence one after another.

Let me just go back. April 25th, 2007, conviction for violation of protective order. August 3rd, 2005, domestic violence arrest. Victim didn't go forward. It was dismissed.

September 4th, 2008, domestic violence arrest.

May 25th, 2009, domestic violence arrest. July 28th,
2010, conviction for simple assault, domestic violence
case. February 15th, 2011, another conviction for a
domestic violence case. March 14th, 2011, domestic
violence arrest. September 9th, 2012, domestic
violence arrest.

The Government recognized that this Defendant

had a horrific up-bringing as demonstrated in the sentencing memo and attachment thereto submitted by the Defendant. We recognize that the Defendant's childhood was tragic, and we recognize the Defendant suffers from mental illness. While that may explain some of his actions, it simply does not excuse this history of beating women, degrading them, selling them into prostitution.

And your Honor, at this point, it stops. And this Court can send a very strong message both to the Defendant and to the community at large that we are simply not going to stand for individuals like this Defendant preying on vulnerable victims, a minor in this case and another young woman, and selling them, selling their bodies behind closed doors in the City of Providence and elsewhere in this State.

The sentence that the Government is asking for today is reasonable. It falls within the guideline range. It is proportional to the sentence that this Court imposed on the Co-Defendant in this case, Ricky Wallace.

In addition to a sentence of 13 years, this Court is required to impose the \$100 special assessment.

Your Honor, the Government is also asking the

Court to impose a term of supervised release in this case that is life, which is the maximum term of supervised release, with the conditions that this Court deems appropriate, mental health counseling, substance abuse counseling and domestic violence counseling.

Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Goldstein.

Mr. Thompson, before you begin, I neglected to ask whether you had had an opportunity to review the presentence report with your client.

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, your Honor. Thank you. We did.

Your Honor, part of the reason that this case took a long time to proceed through the court is because there was a lot of investigation to be done after the initial arrest was made, and a lot of that needed to be done by the Government because they were the ones that had access to the victims to find out what really happened.

And part of the reason it took so long is because after that investigation we took the time with the Government to figure out what the facts were and agree on those facts and put them in the plea agreement and put them in the presentence report.

What you've heard today from the Government, a

lot of it goes well beyond the facts that are in the presentence report, the facts that are in the plea agreement and the facts as they actually occurred.

Mr. Bowie -- and so I want to correct some of those before I go into the rest of the sentencing argument because I don't think that this case, as serious as it is, has been fairly portrayed.

The Government accused Mr. Bowie of beating his Co-Defendant. That did not happen and that is not part of the agreed-to facts. That simply didn't happen. He is accused of coercing her to become a prostitute. That also did not happen. He's accused of today photographing one of the victims in this case and putting her on the Internet. That did not happen. Co-Defendant Wallace did that. And he's accused of forcing these people, and particularly holding the 17-year-old victim in a virtual prison for a week and that did not happen.

There was no force and coercion in this case.

And there's no doubt that this is an extraordinarily serious case and that the mere power differential between an adult and a 17-year-old is well worth the prison sentence you're going to impose today, but the force and coercion counts were dismissed for a reason, and the facts were agreed upon to leave that out for a

reason. It's because it didn't happen.

This 17-year-old victim was free to leave at any time. She was provided with a phone, and she acknowledged that upon later investigation. That's important.

THE COURT: I want you to stop there and I want counsel to approach.

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, your Honor.

(Side-bar conference.)

THE COURT: We are on the record because this is of concern to me. I know that you were not the original prosecutor on the case; that Ms. Chin struck the deal, and I know that part of that was to extract certain of the language that was in the indictment, which would have triggered the 15-year mandatory minimum sentence.

Now, I don't know what happened or didn't happen, but you've alluded to some of it in your presentation and now Mr. Thompson is saying that it didn't happen.

MS. GOLDSTEIN: I can respond, your Honor, in open court to Mr. Thompson's comments. When I made my argument, I did not mean to -- and I understand that Mr. Thompson might have understood it this way. I did not mean to suggest that the Defendant's conduct

satisfied the force, fraud and coercion as to the victim's elements as the Court has just noted. We did not prove up those facts beyond a reasonable doubt, and those counts were dismissed and the Defendant is not facing this 15-year mandatory minimum sentence because of that fact. However, that doesn't mean that the Court can't consider the overall circumstances of the offense even though they may not have risen to the statutory crime of force, fraud and coercion.

The fact is, your Honor, this girl made a call to law enforcement hiding down the street from the apartment away from the Defendant and his Co-Defendant. She had to be -- she did not make that call when she was in the apartment. She ran away and made that call down the street, okay, when she felt that she had a moment to do that. That is a fact and that has not changed. And that is not retracted. She did not feel like she was free to reach out to law enforcement at any time.

THE COURT: That was, as I understand, was with Wallace over in Seekonk and she managed to get away on her own.

MS. GOLDSTEIN: She ran away.

THE COURT: Do you dispute that?

MR. THOMPSON: That factually happened but she

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

also claimed at that point, one, she was actually found back at the house by herself with the phone. MS. GOLDSTEIN: She managed to get ahold of that phone after it was taken away from her. She got it She didn't have it in the beginning. back. THE COURT: Do you agree that she left the house to make the call? MR. THOMPSON: No. She left the house to go running. She did go running. MS. GOLDSTEIN: She made the call outside in the woods outside of the house. MR. THOMPSON: She also claimed that she was kidnapped in Boston and forced by three or four burly men into a car, and videotape proved that that was not, in fact, true. MS. GOLDSTEIN: And that only goes to an opinion that nothing may have happened. MR. THOMPSON: I understand that. My point being what she said when she was calling from the woods in not accurate because she lied she was kidnapped.

THE COURT: The other problem you have is that your client admitted to a conspiracy with Wallace.

MR. THOMPSON: Correct.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. I think I have the picture. Thank you.

(End of side-bar conference.)

MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, your Honor. The last thing I wanted to clarify was that Ms. Goldstein stated that the second victim, I believe, was sexually assaulted and that was by Mr. Wallace, not by --

THE COURT: That's what she said.

MR. THOMPSON: That's what she said. That it was by Mr. Wallace, right.

THE COURT: She said that.

MR. THOMPSON: Correct, your Honor. I'm just clarifying in order to get that separation, which I think is important, because these two did not -- I don't believe they are comparative. My request for sentence for Mr. Bowie, obviously, is two years less than that which you gave to Mr. Wallace.

As I've said repeatedly, your Honor, there's no doubt that this is a very serious crime, and there's also no doubt that 10 years or 12 years or more is a very severe and serious punishment. So I don't think it needs to be pounded into the record how serious it is. There can be no doubt about it.

Mr. Bowie has never done more than 15 months in prison, and he did that on a drug trafficking charge. He's never done more than that. And in fact, his record is a long one but, as Ms. Goldstein stated, it's

primarily driving offenses and even the many domestic charges that she reviewed resulted in only three convictions.

THE COURT: There were also, as I counted them, six convictions for drugs, disorderly conduct and resisting arrest that weren't counted.

MR. THOMPSON: Not counted points-wise, correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: Which means that his score of six is probably just about right.

MR. THOMPSON: Well, I disagree, and you know that from my sentencing memorandum, your Honor. Out of the 15 points he does get on his criminal history, I put in my memo seven until I realized that the two extra points from Probation were also for being on probation on a suspended license case, no other kind of case.

So out of his 15 criminal history points, which would put him squarely in category 6, nine of those are for driving on a suspended license.

I certainly acknowledge to the Court that suspended license cases when they are counted can be important to the Court's sentencing calculation. I think they can reflect on whether someone is willing to abide by an order of the Court. In a much less serious

case where perhaps the Court is looking at sending someone to jail or not to jail or what term of probation to put them under, I think the number of suspended license cases could make a difference. But when you're looking at a sentence of 10 years or 12 years or 13 years, I would suggest that the number of suspended license cases is completely irrelevant to what long sentence is appropriate to punish the Defendant for this crime and to rehabilitate him for this crime and to deter the public and Mr. Bowie specifically for this crime.

Those crimes of driving with a suspended license are completely irrelevant and yet they boost his criminal history score from a category 3 to a category 6. And without the suspended license cases, he would be at a range of 108 to 135 months.

THE COURT: 120 to 135. It's restricted.

MR. THOMPSON: Fair enough, your Honor. 120 to 135. That's exactly right. In any event, squarely on the line of the mandatory minimum sentence in this case of 120 months.

As opposed to his Co-Defendant, Ricky Wallace, who you gave 12 years to, your Honor, Mr. Bowie is not accused of using violence in this case. As opposed to Mr. Wallace, Mr. Bowie does not have prior allegations

or other pending charges in other courts of sexual assault or sex trafficking. Those two facts, I think, are very mitigating and distinguish Mr. Bowie from Mr. Wallace.

Again, those things don't make Mr. Bowie's actions legal in any way, but the violence should not serve as an aggravator in this case. And we need to look at Mr. Bowie himself. As acknowledged by the Government, he suffers from a variety of major mental illnesses and grew up with a really horrific traumatic life. His mother was a drug addict and prostitute. His father was a pimp and a prostitute. He witnessed abuse between them and he suffered abuse from his parents, from the johns that came into the household, and the long-lasting effects of that are obvious both in his mental illness and also, I would argue, in his commission of this crime.

It shouldn't be any surprise that someone who grew up in that kind of situation is not able to relate to others in society in a more normal way and is not able to trust people in a more normal way. And just as when we talk about defendants who grew up the children of drug addicts and drug traffickers, they often turn to drug trafficking when they get older especially if they have the kind of trauma and mental illnesses that

Mr. Bowie has.

Again, not particularly mitigating, but I think it should cause the Court concern of whether a sentence of more than a decade in prison is really necessary to punish this crime and is really necessary to deter Mr. Bowie. The serious mental illnesses that he suffers from are the kind that were -- attempts were being made to deal with them before his incarceration, but now that he's been incarcerated and is getting the proper medication and therapy, he is doing much better. And with the ten-year sentence at least you have to give him, he will be involved, obviously, with more significant counseling.

And as Dr. Parsons points out, perhaps the most important thing for Mr. Bowie is that he remains on a closely-monitored medication regimen but also that he get counseling. One of the things I'm going to be requesting in the sentencing, your Honor, is that you recommend he go to the BOP prison at Fort Devens. And the reason for that is multi-fold. One, it is local so he'll be able to continue to see his children. They've been almost his only support, his family and friends and his children since he's been locked up.

Two, Fort Devens is known for its psychiatric care, and he clearly needs a lot of psychiatric care

and monitoring.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And three, Fort Devens is the place where most sex offenders from this territory go, and he clearly needs some counseling to deal with that as well. don't think particularly because he's what we consider a normal sex offender and has criminal sexual inclinations, but I think more because he grew up in that kind of environment witnessing those kinds of sexual politics and abuse and that kind of thing, and he needs help dealing with that so that when he gets out he doesn't see things as much that way. And I know that's something he's learned about while he's been in prison, seeing how seriously the Federal Government takes these cases, seeing more and more people getting arrested for these crimes and seeing the five and ten and even 15-year mandatory minimum sentences being dished out, that's had an impact on him and how he thinks about this.

So I think it's very important that he does go to Fort Devens, but I think overall, and this is what I wrote in my sentencing memorandum, your Honor, ten years is just a very, very long time in prison. It's a very serious punishment, and I'm not sure that any higher punishment really satisfies any factors of sentencing other than the Government or society getting

its pound of flesh as opposed to recognizing you committed a really serious crime, a horrible crime that you need serious punishment for. But at the same time, you grew up in a horrific environment. You have long-lasting mental health effects and you need help if you're going to survive once you get out.

So is that additional one or two or three years really going to get anybody anything other than the pound of flesh? I'd suggest that ten years is enough punishment. Nothing more than that is necessary for those other factors.

Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Thompson.

Mr. Bowie, is there anything you want to say on your own behalf?

THE DEFENDANT: I just want to start by saying I'm sorry. And due to the stipulations that I'm being brought up on, I always thought that that was normal, the way I grew up; and since I've been incarcerated and I've been around a few gentlemen that have been prosecuted on the same crime as I, I realize how big of a deal it really is. And I just want to say I'm sorry. I'm embarrassed, and I'm very disappointed in myself. And that's it, your Honor.

THE COURT: The Defendant here has requested a

sentence that is the mandatory minimum sentence.

Mr. Thompson has argued very earnestly on behalf of his client as he is required to do; however, there are some points with Mr. Thompson's presentation with which I disagree.

The Defendant's criminal history score in this case is at a category 6. That's taking into account all of the countable convictions, many of which, and he's correct, stem from driving offenses. He has 15 criminal history points by virtue of all of the countable offenses. Criminal history category 6 is 13 and up so he's edging toward a category 7, if there were such a thing.

But where I depart from Mr. Thompson's analysis of the propriety of that category 6 score is the fact that there were so many convictions dating back to 1998 that were not countable, and those were serious offenses as well.

In 1998, there was a conviction for possession of crack, and it appears at least from the description in the presentence report that the Defendant was dealing. He was placed on probation and ordered into substance abuse counseling.

Then in 1999, there's another drug offense. He violated on that, didn't appear.

Then we fast-forward to 2009, and there is a disorderly conduct -- this is at paragraph 66 -- and obstructing a police officer. That wasn't counted.

In 2010, there's a simple assault. That was dismissed but the disorderly conduct domestic, he received a six-month suspended sentence on that one. That wasn't counted.

In 2011, there's another disorderly conduct domestic that wasn't counted. Later in 2011, a resisting arrest, a one-year suspended sentence. That wasn't counted.

So those drug and assaultive convictions were not counted. And so even if, as Mr. Thompson has argued, the criminal history score is inflated by virtue of the many, many driving offenses, even if we were to take those out and consider this record, some of these might have counted. Maybe not, but I can't close my eyes to the fact that Mr. Bowie has had an almost unbroken string of criminal offenses dating back to his teenage years.

I also do not close my eyes to the very tragic circumstances of his own up-bringing. This is not an uncommon situation of people who grow up as Mr. Bowie did, find themselves in a world without having had the benefit of any parental guidance and it is not uncommon

for them to act out.

What distinguishes this case, however, from many of the cases over which I've presided over the many years I've been on this Court is that this is a case involving predatory conduct and victimization of vulnerable people. Making money not by dealing drugs. That's almost understandable given Mr. Bowie's up-bringing and life circumstances. But victimizing young women, one of these young women was a juvenile, for no reason other than to make money is so fundamentally wrong that even given Mr. Bowie's tragic circumstances of his early life, his documented now mental illness, leads me to the conclusion that he is a danger to society.

If he was willing along with Mr. Wallace to engage in the conduct that he has admitted all just for the almighty dollar when he himself could have gone out and gotten a job -- and frankly, if he had been here saying my job is being a drug dealer, I'd have more sympathy.

What I cannot countenance, and that's what I would be doing by exceeding to the request of a mandatory minimum sentence, is to say, well, we can excuse all of that because of his up-bringing and his mental health issues. As I say, the victimization of

another human being as was done in this case, not once but twice, is so fundamentally wrong that anyone who engages in it has to be viewed as a threat, a predator and someone who has to be shut away for a long period of time in order to keep the other young women out there who may fall prey to that conduct safe.

Mr. Bowie now says he's sorry.

I certainly hope so because what you did to those two young women, Mr. Bowie, cannot be erased and it's something that they will have to live with for the rest of their lives. I sincerely hope that they are getting treatment and counseling that they will need in order for them to have some semblance of a normal life.

The guidelines in this case, I think, get it just about right. This is a heinous crime.

Thankfully, it is not one that I've seen a lot, although from what I read in the newspapers, this isn't the only case percolating out there where young men like Mr. Bowie and Mr. Wallace rather than getting themselves a real job go out and decide to victimize women.

And so the sentence that I think most appropriately reflects the Court's concerns as expressed here today, that is the need to protect the public from further conduct of this nature, the need to

punish this Defendant, the need to deter others who may consider this is a good way to make a quick buck, the need for this Defendant to receive treatment and education so that when he does get out of prison he can be a productive member of society, I think the sentence called for by the Government here is an appropriate sentence. And so the sentence I impose on Counts I -- excuse me, Counts II and III is a term of incarceration of 156 months. On Count I, a term of 60 months, all to run concurrently with each other.

The Defendant will be placed on supervised release for a period of ten years as to Counts II and III. On Count I, a term of supervised release of three years, all to run concurrently with each other.

As special conditions of supervised release, the Defendant shall participate in a program of substance abuse treatment, either in or outpatient, whatever is necessary.

The Defendant shall participate in a program of substance abuse testing and submit to up to 72 drug tests per year. The Defendant shall participate in a program of mental health treatment. To the extent that the Defendant has the ability to contribute to the costs of his drug testing, drug treatment and mental health treatment, he is ordered to make those

contributions. He is ordered to participate in sex offender specific treatment as directed by the probation officer and to submit to periodic testing in the form of polygraphs or any other methodology approved by the Court in order to measure his compliance with the conditions of treatment and supervised release.

Again, to the extent that he may have the ability to contribute to the cost of such treatment and testing, he is ordered to make those contributions.

The Defendant shall comply with all applicable federal and state laws regarding the registration of sex offenders in his state of residence, employment and school attendance, and he shall provide verification of compliance to the probation officer.

The Defendant shall have no contact with any child under the age of 18 without the presence of an adult who is aware of the Defendant's criminal history and is approved in advance by the probation officer. So that the record is clear, the reason for this condition is that one of the victims of the Defendant's offense was a minor.

Finally, the Defendant shall have no contact, whether direct or indirect, with the victims of this offense.

I am not imposing any fine in this case since I find that the Defendant does not have the ability to pay a fine since he is indigent and he has minor children and any money he earns while he's incarcerated or on supervised release ought to go to the financial support of his minor children. I must impose the mandatory special assessment of \$100 per count for a total of \$300.

Mr. Bowie, the sentence I've imposed is within your guideline range. I'm reminding you that under the terms of your plea agreement you gave up your right to take an appeal from a sentence that is within that range. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Thompson requested specifically Fort Devens. I do not make specific requests. I will recommend that the Bureau of Prisons place Mr. Bowie in a facility that is able to provide him with the mental health treatment that he needs and which is documented in the Defendant's sentencing memorandum, that it be near Rhode Island to the extent that that is possible so that he may maintain contact with his family. And I'll leave live it to you, Mr. Thompson, to work with the Bureau of Prisons administratively to see where it is that he's placed.

```
1
              MS. GOLDSTEIN: The Government moves to dismiss
 2
      Counts IV and V of the indictment against the
      Defendant.
 3
              THE COURT: Granted. IV and V are dismissed.
 4
 5
              Anything further?
              MS. GOLDSTEIN: Nothing from the Government,
 6
 7
      your Honor.
              MR. THOMPSON: No, your Honor. Thank you.
8
              (Adjourned at 10:55 a.m.)
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

<u>CERTIFICATION</u>

I, Anne M. Clayton, RPR, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages are a true and accurate transcription of my stenographic notes in the above-entitled case.

/s/ Anne M. Clayton

Anne M. Clayton, RPR

April 18, 2016

Date